DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 245 057 UD 023 659

AUTHOR Jordan, K. Forbis; Irwin, Paul M.
TITLE Alternative Approaches for Allocating Federal Funds for the Education of Disadvantaged Children.
PUB DATE 27 Apr 84
NOTE 29p.; Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 23-27, 1984).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Statistical Data (110) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Census Figures; Comparative Analysis; *Disadvantaged; Elementary Secondary Education; Expenditure Per Student; *Federal Aid; Mathematical Formulas; *Poverty; *Resource Allocation
IDENTIFIERS Education Consolidation Improvement Act Chapter 1

ABSTRACT

This paper analyzes alternative approaches to allocating Chapter I funds for the education of disadvantaged children. The paper begins with a short discussion of the traditional method of distributing funds to districts on the basis of low-income student representation and then considers how changes in the poverty count from the 1970 to the 1980 Census have had a redistributive effect on allocation patterns. Using a sample of 12 selected poverty States and 20 urban poverty counties, alternative methods of allocating funds are then analyzed and compared with each other and with the current formula. The alternatives use the following: income adjustments (the proportion of school-age poor children times a State's inverse per capita income); an effort index (based on the percent of a State's income constituted by its expenditures for elementary and secondary education); and population, age 5-17 years. These alternatives are all considered with and without the cost factor, i.e. differences in the average per pupil expenditure among States. A final alternative uses numbers of school-age poor children with no cost factor. Statistical appendices list cost factors for each sample State and county, major cities in the sample counties, and allocations to each sample State and county under the various alternative formulae. (CMG)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED245057

ALTERNATIVE APPROACHES FOR ALLOCATING FEDERAL FUNDS FOR THE EDUCATION OF DISADVANTAGED CHILDREN

K. Forbis Jordan*
Paul M. Irwin*

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

K. Forbis Jordan

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

April 27, 1984

Presented at the 1984 Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association

NOTE: This paper was prepared by the authors in their private capacity and does not represent the position of their employer.

UD023659

ALTERNATIVE APPROACHES FOR ALLOCATING FEDERAL FUNDS
FOR THE EDUCATION OF DISADVANTAGED CHILDREN

The largest federal program of assistance for elementary and secondary education is for the education of disadvantaged children and is funded under chapter 1 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981 (formerly title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, P.L. 89-10). During the 1983-84 school year, the funding level for this program is approximately $2.5 billion to local school districts and $435 million to state educational agencies for programs and services for educationally disadvantaged children. The program's stated purpose is to provide supplemental educational and related services to educationally disadvantaged children who attend schools serving low-income areas.

In practice, funds have been distributed to and within school districts on the basis of counts of school children from low income families. This method has been used as a proxy indicator of the number of educationally disadvantaged children rather than utilizing scores on standardized achievement tests. The underlying assumption has been that a high correlation exists between the incidence of poverty and the incidence of educationally disadvantaged children. A secondary assumption has been that poverty children attending schools in low-income areas were more in need of assistance and were less likely to have supplementary services provided than those attending other schools.

Changes in the incidence of poverty among states and counties as measured by the 1970 and 1980 U. S. Census have had a redistributive impact on the allocation patterns for federal funds for education of the disadvantaged under Chapter 1. The greatest impact has been on rural southern states and urban poverty areas in the older industrial cities in the northeast and the midwest.

CHANGES IN POVERTY COUNTS 1970-1980

Between 1970 and 1980, the U.S. Census estimates of the number of children in poverty declined by 7.2 percent. The total for the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico in 1970 was 8,313,773, and in 1980 was 7,713,310. As shown in Table 1, nearly three-fifths of the nation's 3,129 counties experienced a loss in number of poverty children that was greater than the national average. Slightly more than 30 percent of the counties had losses of 30 percent or more. Only about 25 percent of the counties had any increase in the count of poverty children, with less than 17 percent of the counties having an increase of 7.2 percent or more.

TABLE 1. Percentage Change in Number of Children from Poor Families, 1970 Census to 1980 Census, by County

Percentage Change of Children	Number of Counties	Percent of All Counties
Loss more than -45%	338	10.8%
-45% to -30%	637	20.4%
-29.9% to -15%	735	23.5%
-14.9% to -7.2%	309	9.9%
----------NATIONAL AVERAGE "LOSS" ----------		
-7.19% to 0%	230	7.4%
no change	7	0.2%
0% to 7.2%	227	7.3%
7.21% to 15%	150	4.8%
15.1% to 30%	225	7.2%
30.1% to 45%	111	3.5%
Gain more than 45%	160	5.1%
	3,129	100.1%

The "gainers" and "losers" under the new count of poverty may be found in certain regions of the United States. With the single exception of Florida, all of the "gainer" states are in the northeast and far west. With the single exception of Rhode Island, all "loser" states are in the southeast and the great plains. This information reflects the pattern for states, but the actual impact in a given state may be masked by a series of "loser" and "gainer" counties. A large urban area that is a gainer, e.g., New York City or Chicago, may result in a state having a net increase, but other areas in the state may experience a loss. (This pattern may be found in the states of New York and Illinois as well as other states.) In every state except South Carolina, at least one county experienced an increase in the number of poverty childran, and in all states, at least one county had a reduced number of poverty children. In six states (Alaska, Delaware, Florida, Illinois, Ohio, and Oregon), a majority of the counties experienced a loss in the number of poverty children even though the state as a whole had an increase in the number of poverty children.

FUNDING FORMULA

The formula for the allocation of chapter 1 funds is based on two factors. One is the count of poverty children by county as indicated by the decennial U. S. Census plus migrant, handicapped, and neglected and delinquent children. The second is an adjustment in the payment rate per child that is based on the average per pupil expenditure in the state. The per pupil payment is further adjusted by a cost factor to ensure that payments be no less than 40 percent of 85 percent of the national average per pupil expenditure (NAPPE) and no more than 40 percent of 120 percent of the NAPPE. The result of this cost factor adjustment is to provide a floor for low spending states and a ceiling for high spending states. (See Appendix A for

cost factors by state.) In the event that the appropriation is insufficient, pro rata reductions are made.

The current formula determines the payment for each county by calculating the county's share of the national total of eligible children multiplied by the cost factor. The share is then multiplied by the available appropriation to determine the grant that will be allocated to the county, subject to the provisions of the hold harmless provision. (This latter provision requires that no grant be less than 85 percent of the grant in the preceding year.)

A basic policy issue appears to be what changes, if any, should be made in the allocation formula or the count of poverty children so that Federal funds for education of the disadvantaged are distributed on the basis of the 1980 count of poverty children rather than continuing payments on the basis of the count based on the 1970 Census. One easily can be critical of the interests that "loser" States have in maintaining a level of funding based on a distribution of poverty children that no longer exists, but the counter-point is that these States have been operating programs for disadvantaged children for over 15 years and program administrators contend that funds have never been sufficient to provide full services and programs for all eligible children. An additional issue is the appropriateness of the concept of differential payments per pupil among the states; the result of the current cost factor is that the payment per pupil in high spending states is 150 percent of the payment per pupil in low spending states. The rationale for this difference is that expenditures for similar programs and services will cost more in the high spending states and that the intent of the program is to ensure that programs and services are provided for educationally disadvantaged children, and not to seek to redress differences in expenditures per pupil, or cost of education, through the chapter 1 program.

Analysis of the relative impact of the 1980 Census count of poverty children has been further complicated by three factors. One is that changes are made in the payment rate from one year to the next. These changes make it difficult for a separate analysis to be made of the impact of the shift in the poverty count on the actual funds received by a state, county, or local school district.

As illustrated above, a second factor is that analyses typically focus on the magnitude of changes in payments to states. This tendency masks the intra-state impact, because individual counties do not always follow the pattern reflected in the state totals. For example, New York state may show an increase in poverty, but much of the increase may be centered in a few urban areas with a decline in the rural areas of the state. The same pattern may also be true in other states with a large urban center and rural areas of significant size.

A third factor is the hold harmless provision in the allocation formula under which counties are guaranteed in any fiscal year 85 percent of the allocation for the previous year even though they may have experienced a decline in the number of eligible children. In the first year of funds allocation under the 1980 Census count, this provision results in no county receiving less than 85 percent of the allocation received in the last year under the 1970 Census count so long as the appropriation is sufficient to provide that level of funds. This funding provision prevents the "gainer" counties from receiving the full payment resulting from the increased count of poverty children. The 1980 Census count was first available for use in calculating allocations for the 1982-83 school year, and was used for the supplemental funding in that year. The 1980 data were first used in the regular allocation formula for the 1983-84 allocation.

SUPPLEMENTAL FUNDING

A supplemental appropriation was enacted for the fiscal year (FY) 1982 budget to resolve the concerns over potential "losers" resulting from the change in poverty count and distribution of funds attributable to the shift from the poverty count under the 1970 Census to the count under the 1980 Census. In the allocation of these funds for the 1982-83 school year, $148 million in additional funds was provided to ensure that each county would receive the greater of two amounts--allocations calculated under the 1970 Census count of poverty children or allocations calculated under the 1980 Census count of poverty children. This supplemental payment was made in addition to the 85 percent hold harmless provision in the formula.

For FY 1983 (1983-84 school year), the count of poverty children under 1980 Census data was used in calculating the allocation of funds to the counties. This results in a substantial shift in the share of chapter 1 funds among the counties and states. During consideration of the FY 1983 budget, consideration was given to possible amendments in the components of the allocation formula, but these efforts were not successful. Later, the Congress provided additional funds not to exceed $40 million to be allocated to educational agencies in states where the aggregate allocation is less than 95 percent of their 1982-83 allocation. In these states, the additional funds were distributed to local school districts on a pro rata basis when their 1983-84 allocation fell below the 95 percent level. In those states where the aggregate allocation exceeded 95 percent, no extra funds were provided even if a district's allocation was less than 95 percent of the level of the previous year.

PROCEDURES

Using the universe of all counties in the United States, a constant appropriations amount and a constant cost factor per pupil, allocations for 1982-83 using the 1970 U. S. Census data were compared with those for 1983-84 using 1980 U.S. Census data. Percentage shares and shifts in percentage shares between these two "baseline" simulations were calculated for selected poverty states (SPS) and selected urban poverty counties (UPC). The results of these simulations were used to ascertain the redistributive impact that would occur without any changes and also to serve as the "baseline" for other analyses. (See Appendix C.) The following simulations were used:

1. For base comparison purposes, the actual allocations for 1982-83 and 1983-84 were calculated. (These are referred to as "GRANT for 1982-83" and "GRANT for 1983-84.")

2. Allocation was based solely on the basis of school-age poverty children with no "cost factor" (adjustment for differences in average per pupil expenditure among the states). (This simulation is titled "POV 80 w/o CF.")

3. Funds were allocated on the basis of school-age children without regard to the differences in the incidences of poverty children and a second time the differences in average per pupil expenditure among the states as well (same formula as currently used in the Education Block Grant in Chapter 2 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981). (These simulations are referred to as "KIDS w/ CF" and "KIDS w/o CF.")

4. Allocation of funds was based on the proportion of school-age poverty children multiplied times the state's inverse per capita income factor. This formula was calculated with and without the cost factor adjustment. (These simulations are titled "INCOME w/ CF" and "INCOME w/o CF.")

5. Allocations utilized the proportion of school-age poverty children multiplied times an "effort index" based on the percent that the state's expenditures for elementary and secondary education are of the state's personal income. This factor was calculated with and without the cost factor. (These simulations are referred to as "EFFORT w/ CF" and "EFFORT w/o CF.")

Three constraints were used in the simulations to facilitate the analysis. First, child counts from the 1975 Survey of Income and Education were not utilized in the simulations even though these counts are currently

considered in the allocation of funds. The reason for this decision is that the use of these data has been justified as a means of updating the 1970 Census count; since the actual 1980 Census count is available, the need for updating the 1970 Census count would appear to have passed. Second, the current hold-harmless level of 85 percent has been used in the simulations; even though the merits of the concept might be debatable, the continued use of this adjustment appears very likely. (The base for the hold harmless was the 1982-83 allocation.) Third, payments to the outlying territories and to Puerto Rico have not been considered because of the lack of comparable data.

DATA SOURCES

The sources of all data were the U. S. Bureau of the Census, the Statistical Digest, National Education Association, and the Department of Education. Department of Education data are identical with those used in making the chapter 1 allocations for the 1982-83 and 1983-84 school years. These pupil count data include the migrant, handicapped, and neglected and delinquent children used in the distribution of funds to states and subsequently to counties. This latter group comprises 3.8 percent of the eligible children. The cost factor, or payment rate, data are those used in the 1983-84 allocations.

SAMPLE

For analysis purposes, two groups were identified. First, 12 selected poverty states (SPS) were identified as one portion of the sample. To be included in the sample, a state was required to meet two criteria--a percent of children in poverty based on the 1980 Census that exceeded the national average of 15. 8 percent and a decline in percent of poverty between 1970 and

1980 that exceeded the national average. The following states met these two criteria:

Alabama	Mississippi	South Dakota
Arkansas	New Mexico	Tennessee
Kentucky	North Carolina	Texas
Louisiana	South Carolina	West Virginia

The second sample consisted to 20 urban poverty counties (UPC) that had a percent of children in poverty in the 1980 Census that exceeded the national average of 15.8 percent and also had in excess of 25,000 poverty children. (See Appendix B for the list of counties and the city which they fully or partially encompass.)

FINDINGS

The change in percent of children in poverty was calculated for both groups under study. Data for the selected poverty states indicated that the number of 1980 Census poverty children in the sample decreased to 76 percent of the number reported in the 1970 Census. For the urban poverty counties, the level reported from the 1980 Census increased to 108 percent of the 1970 number of poverty children. Detailed information for each of the states and counties in the sample may be found in the tables in Appendix C.

A summary of the information using the 1982-83 program year as the comparison base is displayed in Table 2. (This was the last year that the 1970 Census data were used in the allocation of chapter 1 funds.) Each of the formulas had some type of redistributive effect. As would have been expected from the shift in poverty between the 1970 and 1980 Census, the UPC group received an increase in allocation between 1982-83 and 1983-84. Removal of the cost factor appeared to benefit the SPS group more than the UPC group. The introduction of an income adjustment to the formula benefitted the SPS group, and the gain was even greater when the cost factor was removed from the formula. All of the SPS states gained more than 10 percent over the 1982-83

TABLE 4. Impact of Alternative Formulae for Allocation of Federal Funds Under Chapter 1 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981 Using Allocations for the 1982-83 Program Year as the Comparison Base

Alternative Formulae	Sample Share	Percent of 82-83	Range	Percent of Sample				
				+/-05 Percent	+06/+10 Percent	over +10 Percent	-06/-10 Percent	under -10 Percent
Grant for 82-83								
Selected Poverty States	29							
Urban Poverty Counties	23							
Grant for 83-84								
Selected Poverty States	26	94	88-108	17	9	0	50	25
Urban Poverty Counties	25	112	87-122	15	10	60	10	5
"No Cost Factor"								
Selected Poverty States	30	108	99-120	67	0	33	0	0
Urban Poverty Counties	23	102	85-145	35	0	45	10	10
Inverse Income w/ CF								
Selected Poverty States	28	103	97-126	67	25	9	0	0
Urban Poverty Counties	24	107	93-137	30	20	40	10	0
Inverse Income w/o CF								
Selected Poverty States	33	119	112-130	0	0	100	0	0
Urban Poverty Counties	21	97	85-163	25	0	40	0	35
Effort Reward w/ CF								
Selected Poverty States	25	93	85-126	25	0	9	9	58
Urban Poverty Counties	25	113	85-132	25	15	40	0	20
Effort Reward w/o CF								
Selected Poverty States	29	104	88-123	50	0	33	9	9
Urban Poverty Counties	23	105	85-144	20	25	30	15	10

TABLE 3. Impact of Alternative Formulae for Allocation of Federal Funds Under Chapter 1 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981 Using Allocations for the 1983-84 Program Year as the Comparison Base

Alternative Formulae	Sample Share	Percent of 83-84	Range	Percent of Sample				
				+/-05 Percent	+06/+10 Percent	over +10 Percent	-06/-10 Percent	under -10 Percent
Grant for 83-84								
Selected Poverty States	26							
Urban Poverty Counties	25							
"No Cost Factor"								
Selected Poverty States	30	115	97-118	9	9	83	0	0
Urban Poverty Counties	23	90	81-123	10	5	40	5	40
Inverse Income w/ CF								
Selected Poverty States	26	109	100-117	9	9	83	0	0
Urban Poverty Counties	24	95	86-119	45	5	10	25	15
Inverse Income w/o CF								
Selected Poverty States	33	126	109-139	0	9	92	0	0
Urban Poverty Counties	21	86	72-143	5	5	40	0	10
Effort Reward w/ CF								
Selected Poverty States	25	99	91-117	58	18	9	17	0
Urban Poverty Counties	25	101	84-115	45	5	20	10	20
Effort Reward w/o CF								
Selected Poverty States	29	111	100-128	33	25	58	0	0
Urban Poverty Counties	23	94	82-126	30	5	15	20	20
Population 5-17 w/ CF								
Selected Poverty States	24	94	81-9[illegible]	67	0	0	25	9
Urban Poverty Counties	19	76	70-100	10	0	0	0	90
Population 5-17 w/o CF								
Selected Poverty States	26	100	81-107	75	17	0	0	9
Urban Poverty Counties	19	76	70-100	10	0	0	0	90

allocation when the cost factor was removed from the "inverse income formula." The introduction of a reward for effort resulted in a reduction to the SPS group and an increase to the UPC group. The pattern of "winners" and "losers" shifted when the cost factor was not used in the effort formula. Only two of the 12 states would have had any reduction in funds from the 1982-83 comparison year. As under other options, the UPC group benefitted most when the cost factor was retained.

Table 3 contains a summary comparison using the 1983-84 allocations as the comparison base. (This was the first year that the 1980 Census data were used in the allocation.) As under the other comparison, the SPS group gained most when the cost factor was not included in the formula and also under the inverse income formula that allocates proportionally more funds to low income states. The "KIDS" or population 5-17 (chapter 2 Education Block Grant) formula was also compared with the 1983-84 base. When the 1983-84 allocations were used as the comparison base, this formula appeared to have minimal impact on the allocations to the SPS group. Only two of the 20 UPC group were within the +/- 5 percent range, and the remaining 18 had losses in excess of 10 percent.

SUMMARY FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary results include the following:

1. The selected poverty states experienced a loss in the number of poverty children that approached 25 percent of the 1970 number of poverty children in those states. In the urban poverty counties, the number of poverty children increased by 8 percent. For the entire nation, the 1980 Census data for the 50 states and the District of Columbia indicate a reduction in the number of poverty children of slightly more than 8 percent.

2. Demographic shifts resulting from the use of the 1980 Census counts of poverty children have the effect of reducing the portion of funds under the current formula that will be

allocated to the selected poverty states and increasing the portion to urban poverty counties.

3. The following findings are specifically related to the instances when the base comparisons were made with the 1982-83 allocations.

   a. The greatest reduction in allocations for the selected poverty states was found in the formula based on a reward for effort (with the cost factor). Effort was defined in terms of expenditures for elementary and secondary education as a percent of per capita personal income.

   b. The least disruption from the 1970 Census distribution count for the selected poverty states was found in the formula using the inverse income adjustment with the cost factor.

   c. The greatest gain for the selected poverty states was in the use of the inverse income without the cost factor.

   d. The greatest reduction for the urban poverty counties was in the formula using inverse income without the cost factor.

   e. The least disruption for the urban poverty counties resulted from the "No Cost Factor" formula, but 9 of the 20 counties had gains of over 10 percent in allocations.

   f. The greatest gain for the urban poverty counties was in the formula based a reward for effort with a cost factor. (Payments under the 1980 Census data as in the 1983-84 Grant also resulted in gains at a slightly lower rate, i.e., 112 as compared with 113.)

4. When the 1983-84 base was used, the following pattern emerged:

   a. Selected poverty states had the greatest gain under the formula using inverse income without a cost factor.

   b. The least disruption for the selected poverty states was in the formulas using a reward for effort with a cost factor and population 5-17 without a cost factor.

   c. The selected poverty states had the greatest loss under the formula using all children aged 5-17 with a cost factor.

   d. The urban poverty counties had the greatest loss under the option using populaion 5-17 and no cost factor.

   f. The least disruption for the total group of urban poverty counties was in the option using a reward for effort with a cost factor, but 8 of the 20 counties would have had losses of 6 percent or more under this option.

g. The urban poverty counties experienced the greatest disruption under the option using population 5-17 totals for all children, with and without the cost factor. Under both options, 18 of the 20 counties would have had losses in excess of 10 percent.

5. Of the 12 selected poverty states, 8 had cost factors indicating that their per pupil expenditure level was at or below 80 percent of the national average per pupil expenditure. Of the 20 urban poverty counties, 4 were at the floor level.

6. None of the selected poverty states was at the ceiling level of 120 percent or more of the national average per pupil expenditure, but 5 of the 20 urban poverty counties were at the celing.

7. Except for New Mexico, the selected poverty states benefitted by elimination of the cost factor; urban poverty counties in selected poverty states also benefitted.

8. Except for Los Angeles which did not benefit under any of the alternatives, various options benefitted or reduced the amount of the simulated allocations for different urban counties.

Analysis of the data suggests the following conclusions:

1. The magnitude of the possible redistribution of funds suggests possible realignments in the traditional political coalition that has supported federal programs for the education of disadvantaged children.

2. The redistributive impact of the 1980 Census can be relieved by the use of alternative formulae, but the result may be a relative loss in funds for counties that have experienced an increase in their relative number of poverty children.

3. Formulas to reduce the loss of funds for selected poverty states can be devised, but they will at the same time reduce the relative proportion of funds allocated to the urban poverty counties.

4. Income adjustments tend to reduce the amount of funds allocated to the urban poverty counties.

5. Removal of the cost factor tends to decrease the proportion of funds allocated to urban poverty counties.

6. Allocation of funds for the education of disadvantaged children on the basis of total population 5-17 reduces the funds for urban poverty counties and does not appear to benefit the states with high proportions of poverty children.

APPENDIX A

COST FACTORS FOR SAMPLE STATES AND COUNTIES

Sample State	Cost Factor
Alabama	$753.30*
Arkansas	753.30*
Kentucky	753.30*
Louisiana	753.30*
Mississippi	753.30*
New Mexico	962.53
North Carolina	753.30*
South Carolina	753.30*
South Dakota	755.19
Tennessee	753.30*
Texas	762.44
West Virginia	824.81

*: indicates average per pupil expenditure at the floor level of 80 percent of 40 percent of the national average per pupil expenditure.

Sample County	
Baltimore City (MD)	1129.95#
Bexar (TX)	762.44
Cook (IL)	1043.08
Cuyahoga (OH)	898.95
Dade (FL)	787.73
Duval (FL)	787.73
El Paso (TX)	762.44
Essex (NJ)	1129.95#
Fulton (GA)	753.30*
Hudson (NJ)	1129.95#
Jefferson (AL)	753.30*
Los Angeles (CA)	954.43
Milwaukee (WI)	1054.11
NYC Counties (NY)	1129.95#
Orleans (LA)	753.30*
Philadelphia (PA)	1094.02
St. Louis City (MO)	841.73
Shelby (TN)	753.30*
Suffolk (MA)	1129.95#
Wayne (MI)	1015.35

#: indicates average per pupil expenditure at the ceiling level of 120 percent of 40 percent of the national average per pupil expenditure.

APPENDIX B

Major Cities in Urban Poverty Counties in the Sample

Urban Poverty County	Major City
Baltimore City (MD)	Baltimore, MD
Bexar (TX)	San Antonio, TX
Cook (IL)	Chicago, IL
Cuyahoga (OH)	Cleveland, OH
Dade (FL)	Miami, FL
Duval (FL)	Jacksonville, FL
Essex (NJ)	Newark, NJ
El Paso (TX)	El Paso, TX
Fulton (GA)	Atlanta, GA
Hudson (NJ)	Jersey City, NJ
Jefferson (AL)	Birmingham, AL
Los Angeles (CA)	Los Angeles, CA
Milwaukee (WI)	Milwaukee, WI
NYC Counties (NY)	New York, NY
Orleans (LA)	New Orleans, LA
Philadelphia (PA)	Philadelphia, PA
St Louis City (MO)	St. Louis, MO
Shelby (TN)	Memphis, TN
Suffolk (MA)	Boston, MA
Wayne (MI)	Detroit, MI

APPENDIX C-1. Selected Poverty States With Data on Poverty Count and Allocations Under Alternative Formulae for the Allocation of Funds Under Chapter 1 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act

(A) STATE	(B) POV 70	(C) POV 80	(D) RATIO C/B	(E) KIDS 80	(F) POV 80/ KIDS 80	(G) GRANT for 82/83	(H) GRANT for 83/84	(I) RATIO H/G	(J) KIDS w/ CF	(K) RATIO J/H	(L) KIDS w/o CF	(M) RATIO L/H
Alabama	272	196	72	855	23	65381	57731	88	55626	96	56201	97
Arkansas	155	109	70	487	22	37510	33791	90	32415	96	33454	99
Kentucky	208	164	79	703	21	50868	48031	94	44629	93	48106	100
Louisiana	309	220	71	952	23	74374	67972	91	64418	95	67117	99
Mississippi	262	177	68	591	30	62599	54924	88	53525	97	53962	98
New Mexico	81	64	79	297	22	21620	23294	108	18835	81	18756	81
North Carolina	313	218	70	1234	18	75219	68323	91	65864	98	72956	107
South Carolina	207	143	69	692	21	49713	44198	89	43005	97	45064	102
South Dakota	34	27	79	145	19	8847	8281	94	8185	99	8860	107
Tennessee	245	191	78	956	20	59636	56689	95	51329	91	53638	95
Texas	637	565	89	3080	18	164504	166865	101	154642	93	170104	102
West Virginia	106	74	70	408	18	27032	25145	93	23791	95	24564	98
SAMPLE TOTAL	2829	2148	76	10480	20	697303	655244	94	617244	94	652782	100
NATIONAL TOTAL	8006	7377		46558		2441094	2548420		2548420		2548420	
SAMPLE SHARE	35	29		23		29	26		24		26	

APPENDIX C-2. Allocations to Selected Poverty States Under Alternative Formulae for Chapter 1 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act Using 1982-83 Allocations as the Base

STATE	(B) GRANT for 82/83	(C) POV 80 w/o CF	(D) RATIO C/B	(E) EFFORT w/ CF	(F) RATIO F/B	(G) EFFORT w/o CF	(H) RATIO G/B	(I) INCOME w/ CF	(J) RATIO I/B	(K) INCOME w/o CF	(L) RATIO K/B
Alabama	55381	68303	104	55644	85	57837	88	67444	103	80030	122
Arkansas	37510	38280	102	32691	87	36414	97	37387	100	44489	119
Kentucky	50868	56545	111	44961	88	51556	101	55514	109	65962	130
Louisiana	74374	77005	104	68151	92	78148	105	72235	97	83130	112
Mississippi	62593	61760	99	53646	86	56528	90	61085	98	71654	114
New Mexico	21620	22487	104	27219	126	26623	123	27182	126	25484	118
North Carolina	75219	77364	103	66163	88	73965	98	75344	100	87845	117
South Carolina	49713	50325	101	43685	88	50207	101	49723	100	58451	118
South Dakota	8847	9695	110	8821	100	10599	120	9340	106	10983	124
Tennessee	59636	66908	112	51685	87	58649	98	65586	110	77649	130
Texas	164504	137029	120	164935	100	196946	120	167252	102	192512	117
West Virginia	27032	26768	99	27715	103	31128	115	28126	104	30344	112
SAMPLE TOTAL	697303	752469	108	645217	93	728601	104	716318	103	828533	119
NATIONAL TOTAL	2441094	2548420		2548420		2548420		2548420		2548420	
SAMPLE SHARE	29	30		25		29		28		33	

APPENDIX C-3. Allocations to Selected Poverty States Under Alternative Formulae for Chapter 1 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act Using 1983-84 Allocations as the Base

(A) STATE	(B) GRANT for 83/84	(C) POV 80 w/o CF	(D) RATIO C/B	(E) INCOME w/ CF	(F) RATIO E/B	(G) INCOME w/o CF	(H) RATIO G/B	(I) EFFORT w/ CF	(J) RATIO I/B	(K) EFFORT w/o CF	(L) RATIO K/B
Alabama	57731	68303	118	67444	117	80030	139	55644	96	57837	100
Arkansas	33791	38280	113	37387	111	44489	132	32961	98	36414	108
Kentucky	48031	56545	118	55514	116	65962	137	44961	94	51556	107
Louisiana	67972	77005	113	72235	106	83130	122	68151	100	78148	115
Mississippi	54924	61760	112	61085	111	71654	130	53646	98	56528	103
New Mexico	23294	22487	97	27182	117	25484	109	27219	117	26523	114
North Carolina	68323	77364	113	75344	110	87845	129	66163	97	73965	108
South Carolina	44198	50325	114	49723	113	58451	132	43685	99	50207	114
South Dakota	8281	9695	117	9340	113	10983	133	8821	107	10599	128
Tennessee	56689	66908	118	65686	116	77649	137	51685	91	58649	103
Texas	166865	197029	118	167252	100	192512	115	164835	99	193946	116
West Virginia	25145	26768	106	28126	112	30344	121	27716	110	31129	124
SAMPLE TOTAL	655244	752469	115	716318	109	828533	126	645487	99	728601	111
NATIONAL TOTAL	2548420	2548420		2548420		2548420		2548420		2548420	
SAMPLE SHARE	26	30		28		33		25		29	

APPENDIX C-4: Urban Poverty Counties with Data on Poverty Count and Allocations Under Alternative Formulae for the Allocation of Funds Under Chapter 1 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act

(A) COUNTY	(B) POV 70	(C) POV 80	(D) RATIO C/B	(E) POP 5-17 1980	(F) RATIO C/E	(G) GRANT for 82/83	(H) GRANT for 83/84	(I) RATIO H/G	(J) KIDS w/ CF	(K) RATIO J/H	(L) KIDS w/o CF	(M) RATIO L/H
Baltimore City (MD)	55	49	89	156	31	19482	21465	110	16559	77	16559	77
Bexar (TX)	56	56	100	229	24	14186	15789	111	12058	76	12058	76
Cook (IL)	175	209	119	1072	19	72057	82314	114	61249	74	61249	74
Cuyahoga (OH)	48	44	92	288	15	13731	15110	110	12492	83	12492	83
Dade (FL)	45	69	153	303	23	16820	20517	122	14297	70	14297	70
Duval (FL)	29	25	86	118	21	7309	7513	103	6213	83	6213	83
Essex (NJ)	37	48	130	180	27	17729	20914	118	15070	72	15070	72
El Paso (TX)	27	35	130	122	29	8706	9992	115	7400	74	7400	74
Fulton (GA)	33	33	100	117	28	7969	9378	118	6774	72	6774	72
Hudson (NJ)	20	28	140	107	26	10171	11964	118	8645	72	8645	72
Jefferson (AL)	38	27	71	133	20	9001	7651	85	7651	100	7651	100
Los Angeles (CA)	205	258	126	1437	18	85715	99374	116	72857	73	72657	73
Milwaukee (WI)	26	28	108	183	15	10227	12275	120	9317	76	8693	71
NYC Counties (NY)	329	391	119	1276	31	152407	175304	115	130973	75	130305	74
Orleans (LA)	53	43	81	115	37	12674	12072	95	10773	89	10773	89
Philadelphia (PA)	85	94	111	322	29	32426	39328	122	27652	70	27562	70
St. Louis City (MO)	38	28	74	84	33	10067	8721	87	8557	98	8557	98
Shelby (TN)	51	45	88	168	27	12386	12712	103	10529	83	10529	83
Suffolk (MA)	28	30	107	105	29	11242	12833	114	9556	74	9556	74
Wayne (MI)	82	98	120	505	19	40247	39362	98	34210	87	34210	87
SAMPLE TOTAL	1523	1638	108	7020	23	564602	634708	112	482832	76	481450	76
NATIONAL TOTAL	8006	7377	109	46558	16	2441094	2546420		2548420		2548420	
SAMPLE SHARE	19	22		15		23	25		19		19	

APPENDIX C-5. Allocations to Urban Poverty Counties Under Alternative Formulae for Chapter 1 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act Using 1982-83 Allocations as the Base

(A) COUNTY	(B) GRANT for 82/83	(C) POV 80 w/o CF	(D) RATIO C/B	(E) EFFORT w/ CF	(F) RATIO E/B	(G) EFFORT w/o CF	(H) RATIO G/B	(I) INCOME w/ CF	(J) RATIO I/B	(K) INCOME w/o CF	(L) RATIO K/B
Baltimore City (MD)	19462	17484	90	21421	110	17841	92	19611	101	16559	85
Bexar (TX)	14186	19179	135	15531	109	19171	135	15835	112	18696	132
Cook (IL)	72057	72983	101	74759	104	67450	94	73680	102	63586	88
Cuyohoga (OH)	13781	15504	113	13635	99	14275	104	15276	111	15297	111
Dade (FL)	16820	23883	142	17246	103	20604	122	21313	127	24355	145
Duval (FL)	7309	8746	120	6316	86	7545	103	7805	107	8919	122
Essex (NJ)	17729	17137	97	23430	132	19514	110	18022	102	15070	85
El Paso (TX)	8706	12138	139	9829	113	12132	139	10022	115	11832	136
Fulton (GA)	7969	11524	145	9156	115	11438	144	10879	137	13001	163
Hudson (NJ)	10171	9803	96	13403	132	11163	110	10309	101	8645	85
Jefferson (AL)	9001	9222	102	7651	85	7651	85	9091	101	10684	119
Los Angeles (CA)	85715	96207	112	84852	99	83668	98	86017	100	81128	95
Milwaukee (WI)	10227	10679	104	13509	132	12060	118	12533	123	10703	105
NYC Counties (NY)	152407	130305	85	198518	130	165339	108	163839	108	130546	86
Orleans (LA)	12674	14904	118	12145	96	15173	120	13605	107	13258	105
Philadelphia (PA)	32426	33285	103	40230	124	34659	107	40171	124	33054	102
St. Louis City (MO)	10067	9523	95	8557	85	8557	85	9389	93	10040	100
Shelby (TN)	12386	15478	125	10631	86	13281	107	15164	122	18121	146
Suffolk (MA)	11242	10478	93	12312	110	10254	91	12232	109	9745	87
Wayne (MI)	40247	35991	89	45116	112	41817	104	37995	94	34210	85
SAMPLE TOTAL	564602	574453	102	638307	113	593592	105	602788	107	547449	97
NATIONAL TOTAL	2441094	2548420	102	2548420		2548420		2548420		2548420	
SAMPLE SHARE	23	23		25		23		24		21	

APPENDIX C-6. Allocations to Urban Poverty Counties Under Alternative Formulae for Chapter 1 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act Using 1983-84 Allocations as the Base

(A) COUNTY	(B) GRANT for 83/84	(C) POV 80 w/o CF	(D) RATIO C/B	(E) EFFORT w/ CF	(F) RATIO E/B	(G) EFFORT w/o CF	(H) RATIO G/B	(I) INCOME w/ CF	(J) RATIO I/B	(K) INCOME w/o CF	(L) RATIO K/B
Baltimore City (MD)	21465	17484	81	21421	100	17841	83	19611	91	16559	77
Bexar (TX)	15789	19179	121	15531	98	19171	121	15835	100	18696	118
Cook (IL)	82314	72983	89	74759	91	67450	82	73680	90	63586	77
Cuyahoga (OH)	15110	15504	103	13635	90	14275	94	15276	101	15297	101
Dade (FL)	20517	23883	116	17246	84	20604	100	21313	104	24355	119
Duval (FL)	7513	8746	116	6316	84	7545	100	7805	104	8919	119
Essex (NJ)	20914	17137	82	23430	112	19514	93	18022	86	15070	72
El Paso (TX)	9992	12138	121	9829	98	12132	121	10022	100	11832	118
Fulton (GA)	9378	11524	123	9156	98	11438	122	10879	116	13001	139
Hudson (NJ)	11964	9803	82	13403	112	11163	93	10309	86	8645	72
Jefferson (AL)	7651	9222	121	7651	100	7651	100	9091	119	10684	140
Los Angeles (CA)	99374	96207	97	84852	85	83668	84	86017	87	81128	82
Milwaukee (WI)	12275	10679	87	13509	110	12060	98	12533	102	10703	87
NYC Counties (NY)	175304	130305	74	198518	113	165339	94	163839	93	130546	74
Orleans (LA)	12072	14904	123	12145	101	15173	126	13605	113	13258	110
Philadelphia (PA)	39528	33285	84	40290	102	34659	88	40171	102	33054	84
St. Louis City (MO)	8721	9523	109	8557	98	8557	98	9389	108	10040	115
Shelby (TN)	12712	15478	122	10631	84	13281	104	15164	119	18121	143
Suffolk (MA)	12833	10478	82	12312	96	10254	80	12232	95	9745	76
Wayne (MI)	39362	35991	91	45116	115	41817	106	37995	97	34210	87
SAMPLE TOTAL	634788	574453	90	638307	101	593592	94	602788	95	547449	86
NATIONAL TOTAL	2548420	2548420	90	2548420		2548420		2548420		2548420	
SAMPLE SHARE	25	23		25		23		24		21	